

THE EISENHOWER LIBRARY



3 1151 02745 1594

70
C.A.
HT2
AG

THE

ANTI-SLAVERY REPORTER.

No. 64.] AUGUST, 1, 1830. [Vol. iii. No. 16.

- I. PROCEEDINGS OF PARLIAMENT ON THE SUBJECT OF COLONIAL SLAVERY—SPEECH AND REPLY OF MR. BROUGHAM—SPEECHES OF MESSRS. PROTHEROE, DOUGLAS, SMITH, AND HORTON, SIR G. MURRAY, MESSRS. CAVE, AND MANNING, SIR F. BURDETT, SIR R. PEEL, MR. TWISS, MR. BUXTON, AND SIR A. GRANT—CASE OF PERSECUTION—GENERAL ELECTION—BRISTOL—YORKSHIRE.
- II. CASE ILLUSTRATIVE OF JAMAICA SOCIETY AND MANNERS.

I.—PROCEEDINGS IN PARLIAMENT ON THE SUBJECT OF
COLONIAL SLAVERY.

ON the 1st of July Mr. BROUGHAM presented to the House of Commons the petition from the Committee of the Anti-Slavery Society, (inserted in the Supplement to the Reporter, No. 61, p. 269) on which occasion he thus expressed himself: "Sir, I rise to present a petition, on a subject of the greatest possible importance, and one which does not derive that importance from circumstances of an adventitious nature; but as the natural consequence of its own intrinsic weight. The subject matter of the petition which I hold in my hand, is slavery, with all its frightful consequences—that system by which hundreds of thousands of the King's subjects, and of our fellow-creatures, are held in bondage within the dominions of his Majesty. This petition comes from a meeting, which was equalled by none that I ever saw, though nowise unaccustomed to public meetings, in numbers, weight, and personal respectability. It consisted of persons of various sects, of opposite parties, and of different classes, whom zeal and feeling in behalf of this cause called together. If I were to say that above two thousand persons, such as I have described, were assembled together on the great occasion, on which this petition was agreed to, and that the same number of persons entitled to the same description departed for want of accommodation in the great hall in which the meeting was held, I should not exaggerate the account as to numbers; and as little should I exaggerate if I said that I never attended at any public meeting, even when those composing it were the most likely to be aroused, as upon any question of religious controversy or political principle—even at such meetings, never did I see any thing like the exhibition of feeling, by which the persons who composed this meeting were apparently guided and impelled. The proceedings of that day were, in my mind, most interesting; and when I look to the names affixed to this petition it becomes still more interesting. The first name is that of a most venerable person, one whose eloquence has often delighted this house, and the purity of whose private life would have rendered him distinguished, even if the importance of his public services had not given him a place amongst the greatest, as well as the most amiable benefactors of mankind. It

is scarcely necessary for me to name Mr. Wilberforce, whom I have already endeavoured, though faintly and imperfectly, to describe by his talents and his virtues. His name is the first, and in fit and meet conjunction with it is the name of Thomas Clarkson, one remarkable even amongst those the most distinguished for unwearied zeal and perseverance in the cause of humanity. That gentleman, it is well known, has devoted his talents, his learning, and his untamable zeal in promoting the abolition of slavery. It is only necessary for me to say, that there are other names fit to follow those, who have been most appropriately chosen to lead in this petition. The petitioners approach this house in the language of respect; but at the same time of calm remonstrance. They state that just seven years have elapsed since the resolutions of the 15th of May, 1823, respecting Colonial Slavery were unanimously adopted by this house, the only difference of opinion then being, whether they went far enough; and certainly, the only difference at the meeting from which this petition emanated being, whether *they* now went far enough to meet the exigencies of the case.

“The petition, after stating that hardly any of the measures recognised by the resolutions of May, 1823, have been adopted by the colonial legislatures, and have been imperfectly fulfilled even in those colonies where the crown could have dictated the adoption of such measures, naturally, in substance if not in words, takes the form of a remonstrance, and asks how long Parliament will suffer itself to be thus trifled with. After the repeated pledges given on this subject, the petitioners express their surprise—and they might have well expressed a stronger feeling—upon finding that the West India Committee at home had not scrupled to express its concurrence and approbation of the conduct of the local legislatures. The petitioners go on to state, that the measures proposed by Parliament for facilitating the manumission of slaves, have been adopted in any degree only in the crown colonies; in the others not at all. In these also, even where a shew of admitting slave evidence, for example, is made, it is done so partially and ineffectively as to produce no benefit to the slave; and although something has also ostensibly been done with respect to Sunday markets, in some of the chartered colonies, yet no time being allowed to the slave in lieu of Sunday, what has been done is wholly inadequate and evasive. Besides which, in no one of the colonies, having legislatures of their *own*, have the steps been taken of putting an end to the flogging of females or to the use of the driving whip, or towards establishing the principle of the compulsory manumission of the slaves.—I abstain from entering further into detail on this mighty question, not differing with the petitioners as to its urgency, nor harbouring the slightest shadow of doubt that the time is arrived when this subject cannot be trifled with further. Acting on that impression, I have given notice of a specific proposition, which I am in hopes will enable the House to deal with this question before the end of the present session. I think this is due to the subject—to the colonies—to hundreds of thousands of our fellow subjects, suffering in unabated and unceasing bondage. It is due to ourselves who, seven long years ago, carried our recommendations to the foot of the Throne; and it is due to the Crown itself which adopted the recommendations

of this House. Above all, Sir, it is due to our constituents, to the people of this country, who are deeply interested in the question; and I for one would not wish, indeed I could hardly venture to meet those whose confidence I desire most to enjoy, if I had not taken some step towards enabling this House to discuss the question of Negro Slavery before the conclusion of the present session.—On that occasion I would fain hope that this House will again raise its voice on behalf of the hundreds of thousands of our fellow creatures now suffering in Slavery.”

On the 13th of July, Mr. BROUGHAM brought forward the promised discussion, grounded on a motion pledging the House to proceed, at the earliest practicable period in the next session, to take into its serious consideration the mitigation and final abolition of Slavery, together with the amendment of the administration of justice in the slave colonies of Great Britain.

This motion he prefaced with a speech to the following effect.—

“Sir,—In rising to bring before the House a subject more momentous, in the eyes both of this country and of the world, than any that has occupied our attention during the whole of a long protracted session, I feel that I owe some apology for entering upon it at so late a day. I know too, that I am blamed in many quarters, for not postponing it till another session. But the apology which I am about to offer is, not for bringing it forward to-day, but for having delayed it so long; and I feel that I should be indeed without excuse; that I should stand convicted of a signal breach of public duty, to the character and the honour of the House, to the feelings and principles of the people, nay, to the universal feelings of mankind at large, by whatever names they may be called, into whatever families distributed, if I had not an ample defence to urge for having so long put off the agitation of this great question. Occurrences which happened at the commencement of the session, and the matters of pressing interest which attended its close, must plead my justification. Early in the year I had hoped that the Government would redeem the pledges which they gave me last session, and which then stayed my steps. I had expected to have the satisfaction of seconding a measure propounded by the ministers of the crown for improving the administration of justice in the colonies, and especially for amending the law which excludes the testimony of slaves. That those expectations have been frustrated, that those pledges remain unredeemed, I may lament, but in fairness I am bound to say I cannot charge as matter of severe blame on the Government, because I know the obstacles of a financial nature, which have stood in the way of intentions sincerely entertained to provide a pure and efficient system of judicature for the West India islands. Until I saw that no such reforms could be looked for in that high quarter, I was precluded from undertaking the subject, lest my efforts might mar the work in hands far more able to execute it. This is my defence for now addressing you at the end of the parliamentary year; but to imagine that I can hold my peace a moment longer, that I can suffer the parliament to be prorogued, and above all to be dissolved, and the country to be assembled for the choice of new representatives, without calling on the House for a solemn pledge which

may bind its successors to do their duty by the most defenceless and wretched portion of their fellow subjects, is so manifestly out of the question, that I make no apology for the lateness of the day, and disregard even the necessary absence of many of the fastest friends of the cause,* and the general slackness of attendance incident to the season, as attested by the state of these benches, which might well dissuade me from going on.

“And now, after the question of colonial slavery has for so many years been familiar to the House, and I fear still more familiar to the country, I would fain hope that I may dispense with the irksome task of dragging you through its details, from their multiplicity so overwhelming, from their miserable nature so afflicting. But I am aware that in the threshold of the scene, and to scare me from entering upon it, there stands the phantom of colonial independence, resisting parliamentary interference, fatiguing the ear with the thrice-told tale of their ignorance who see from afar off, and pointing to the fatal issue of the American war. There needs but one steady glance to brush all such spectres away. That the colonial legislatures have rights—that their privileges are to be respected—that their province is not to be lightly invaded—that the parliament of the mother country is not without necessity to trench on their independence—no man more than myself is willing to allow. But when those local assemblies utterly neglect their first duties—when we see them from the circumstances of their situation prevented from acting—struggling in these trammels for an independent existence—exhausted in the effort to stand alone—and to move one step wholly unable;—when at any rate we wait for years, and perceive that they advance not by a hair’s breadth, either because they cannot, or because they dare not, or because they will not;—then to contend that we should not interfere—that we should fail in *our* duty because they do not theirs—nay, that we have no right to act, because they have no power or no inclination to obey us, would be not an argument, but an abomination, a gross insult to Parliament, a mockery of our privileges—for I trust that we too have some left—a shameful abandonment of our duty, and a portentous novelty in the history of parliament, the plantations, and the country.

“Talk not of the American contest, and the triumph of the colonists! Who that has read the sad history of that event (and I believe among the patriarchs of this cause whom I now address there are some who can remember that disgrace of our counsels and our arms), will say, that either the Americans triumphed, or we quailed, on one inch of the ground upon which the present controversy stands? Ignorance the most gross, or inattention the most heedless, can alone explain, but cannot at all justify the use of such a topic. Be it remembered, and to set at rest the point of right, I shall say no more—let it not once be forgotten that the supremacy of the mother country never for an instant was surrendered at any period of that calamitous struggle. Nay, in

* He alluded to Sir J. Mackintosh, Dr. Lushington, Mr. Buxton, Mr. Sykes, Mr. W. Whitmore, and others, who were unavoidably absent on the occasion.

the whole course of it, a question of her supremacy never once was raised; the whole dispute was rigorously confined to the power of taxing. All that we gave up, as *we* said voluntarily, as the Americans more truly said by compulsion, was the power to tax; and by the very act which surrendered this power, we solemnly, deliberately, and unequivocally reasserted the right of the Parliament to give laws to the plantations in all other respects whatever. Thus speaks the record of history, and the record of our statute book. But were both history and the laws silent, there is a fact so plain and striking, that it would of itself be quite sufficient to establish the doctrine of parliamentary supremacy. I believe it may safely be affirmed, that on neither side of the water was there a man more distinguished for steady devotion to the cause of colonial independence, or who made his name more renowned by firm resistance to the claims of the mother country, than Mr. Burke. He was in truth throughout that memorable struggle the great leader in Parliament against the infatuated ministry, whose counsels ended in severing the empire: and far from abating in his opposition as the contest advanced, he sacrificed to those principles the favour of his constituents, and was obliged to withdraw from the representation of Bristol, which till then he had held. His speech on that occasion reaffirms the doctrines of American independence. But neither then nor at any other time did he ever think of denying the general legislative supremacy of Parliament; he only questioned the right of taxing the unrepresented colonies. But another fact must at once carry conviction to every mind. During the heat of the controversy, he employed himself in framing a code for the government of our sugar colonies. It was a bill to be passed into a law by the legislature of the mother country; and it has fortunately been preserved among his invaluable papers. There is no minute detail into which its provisions do not enter. The rights of the slave, the duties of the master, the obligation to feed and clothe, the restriction of the power of coercion and punishment, all that concerns marriage and education and religious instruction, all that relates to the hours of labour and rest,—every thing is minutely provided for, with an abundance of regulation which might well be deemed excessive, were not the subject that unnatural state of things which subjects man to the dominion of his fellow creatures, and which can only be rendered tolerable by the most profuse enactment of checks and controls. This measure of most ample interference was decreed by the most illustrious champion of colonial rights, the most jealous watchman of English encroachments. With his own hand he sketched the bold outline; with his own hand he filled up its details; with his own hand, long after the American contest had terminated, after the controversy on negro freedom had begun, and when his own principles touching the slave trade and slavery had bent before certain West India prejudices communicated by the party of the planters in Paris with whom he made common cause on revolutionary politics,—even then, instead of rejecting all idea of interference with the rights of the colonial assemblies, he delivered over his plan of a slave code to Mr. Dundas, then Secretary for the colonies, for the patronage and adoption of himself and Mr. Pitt. I offer this fact as a striking proof that it is worse than a jest, it is an

unpardonable delusion, to fancy that there ever has existed a doubt of the right of Parliament to give the colonies laws.

“ But I am told, that granting the right to be ours, we ought to shrink from the exercise of it when it would lead to an encroachment upon the sacred rights of property. I desire the House to mark the short and plain issue to which I am willing to bring this matter. I believe there is no man, either in or out of the profession to which I have the honour of belonging, and which over all others inculcates upon its children an habitual veneration for civil rights, less disposed than I am lightly to value those rights, or rashly to inculcate a disregard of them. But that renowned profession has taught me another lesson also; it has imprinted on my mind the doctrine which all men, the learned and the unlearned, feel to be congenial with the human mind, and to gather strength with its growth—that law above and prior to all the laws of human lawgivers, for it is the law of God—that there are some things which cannot be holden in property, and above every thing else, that man can have no property in his fellow-creature. But I willingly avoid those heights of moral argument, where, if we go in search of first principles, we see eternal fogs reign, and “ find no end in wandering mazes lost.” I had rather seek the humbler regions, and approach the level plain where all men see clear, where their judgments agree, and common feelings knit their hearts together; and standing on that general level, I ask, what is the right which one man claims over the person of another, as if he were a chattel and one of the beasts which perish? Is this that kind of property which claims universal respect, and is clothed in the hearts of all with a sanctity which makes it inviolable? I resist the claim; I deny the title: as a lawyer I demur to the declaration of the right; as a man I set up a law superior in point of antiquity, higher in point of authority than any which men have framed—the law of nature; and, if you appeal from that, I set up the law of the Christian dispensation, which holds all men equal, and commands that you treat every man as a brother! Talk to me not of such monstrous pretensions being decreed by acts of parliament, and recognised by treaties! Go back a quarter of a century to a kindred contest, when a long and painful struggle ended in an immortal triumph. The self-same arguments were urged in defence of the slave trade. Its vindication was rested upon the rights of property, as established by laws and by treaties: the right to trade in men was held to be as clear then as the right to hold men in property is held to be clear now. For twenty-five years, I am ashamed to repeat, for twenty-five years, to the lasting disgrace of the Parliament, the African slave traffic was thus defended; and that which it was then maintained every one had a right to do, is now denounced by our laws as piracy, and whoso doeth it shall be hanged as a felon.

“ But I am next told, that be the right as it may, the facts are against me; that the theory may be with those who object to slavery, but the practice is in favour of the system. The negroes are all well off, it seems; they are inured to the state in which they have been born and grown up; they are happy and contented, and we shall only hurt them by changing their condition, which the peasantry of England are desired to regard with envy. I will not stoop to answer such out-

rageous assertions by facts or by reasons. I will not insult your understanding, by proving, that no slave can know happiness or comfort; that where a man is at the nod of another, he can know nothing of real peace or repose. But I will at once appeal to two tests; to these I shall confine myself, satisfied that if they fail to decide the question, I may resort in vain to any arguments which philosophers can admit, or political economists entertain, or men of ordinary common sense handle.

“ The two tests or criteria of happiness among any people, which I will now resort to, are the progress of population, and the amount of crime. These, but the first especially, are of all others the most safely to be relied on. Every one who has studied the philosophy of human nature, and every one who has cultivated statesmanlike wisdom, which indeed is only that philosophy reduced to practice, must admit, that the principle implanted in our nature, which ensures the continuance of the species is so powerful, that nothing can check its operation but some calamitous state of suffering, which reverses the natural order of things. Wherever, then, we see the numbers of men stationary, much more when we perceive them decreasing, we may rest assured that there is some fatal malady, some fundamental vice in the condition of the community, which makes head against the most irresistible of all impulses. Now look to the history of the black population, both free and slave, in the Antilles. In the British islands, excluding the island of Barbadoes, on a population of 670,000 slaves, there was a decrease of 31,500 in the six years which elapsed between 1818 and 1824; in Jamaica alone, upon the number of 330,000, a decrease of between 8,000 and 9,000. But not so with the free men: although placed in circumstances exceedingly unfavourable to increase of numbers, yet such is the natural fruitfulness of the negro race that they rapidly multiplied. The Maroons doubled between 1749 and 1782; and when great part of them were removed after the rebellion of 1796, those who remained increased in six years, from 1810 to 1816, no less than 18 per cent.; and in five years, from 1816 to 1821, 14 per cent. In North America, where they are better fed, the negroes have increased in thirty years no less than 130 per cent. Look next to Trinidad: in the four years, from 1825 to 1829, the slaves have fallen off from 23,117 to 22,436, notwithstanding a considerable importation; being a decrease of at least a 34th, but probably of a 20th. But what has happened to the same race, and circumstanced alike as to climate, soil, food, in short every thing save liberty? Nature has with them upheld her rights; her first great law has been obeyed; the passions and the vigour of man have had their course unrestrained; and the increase of his numbers has attested his freedom. They have risen in the same four years, from 13,995 to 16,412, being a rate, when due allowances have been made for manumissions, which would double their numbers in twenty years; the greatest rate at which population is in any circumstances known to increase.*

* We shall be able to show, that even this frightful contrast, instead of being exaggerated, as was asserted by Mr. K. Douglas, is below the mark. The de-

" There cannot be a more appalling picture presented to the reflecting mind than that of a people decreasing in numbers. To him who can look beyond the abstract numbers, whose eye is not confined to the mere tables and returns of population, but ranges over the miseries of which such a diminution is the infallible symptom ; it offers a view of all the forms of wretchedness, suffering in every shape, privations in unlimited measure—whatever is most contrary to the nature of human beings, most alien to their habits, most averse to their happiness and comfort,—all beginning in slavery, the state most unnatural to man ; consummated through various channels in his degradation, and leading to one common end, the grave. Show me but the simple fact, that the people in any country are regularly decreasing, so as in half a century to be extinct ; and I want no other evidence that their lot is that of the bitterest wretchedness ; nor will any other facts convince me that their general condition can be favourable or mild.

" The second general test to which I would resort for the purpose of trying the state of any community, without the risk of those deceptions to which particular facts are liable, is the number of crimes committed. In Trinidad, I find that the slaves belonging to plantations, in number 16,580, appear by the records printed, to have been punished in two years for 11,131 offences ; that is to say, deducting the number of infants incapable of committing crimes, every slave had committed some offence in the course of those two years. It is true that the bulk of those offences, 7,644, were connected with their condition of bondage—refusing to work, absconding from the estate, insolence to their owner or overseer ; all incidental to their sad condition, but all visited with punishment betokening its accompanying debasement. Nevertheless, other crimes were not wanting : 713 were punished for theft, or above 350 in a year, on a number of about 12,000, deducting persons incapacitated by infancy, age, or sickness, from being the subjects of punishment. Let any one consider what this proportion would give in England : it would amount to 350,000 persons punished in one year for larceny. In Berbice, on a population of 21,000, were 9,000 punishments ; no record being kept of those in plantations of six slaves or under : and in Demerara, of 61,000 plantation slaves, there were 20,567 punished, of whom 8,461 were women. I cannot here withhold from the House the testimony of the protector of slaves, to the happiness of their condition. ' I cannot,' says that judicious officer, ' refrain from remarking on the contented appearance of the negroes ; and from the opportunities of judging which I have, I think that generally they have every reason to be so.' I would not have this protector placed in the condition of the very happiest of this contented tribe,

crease of the slaves in Trinidad, from 1818 to 1824, was 3868, or 2 $\frac{1}{2}$ per cent. per annum. The rate of decrease from 1825 to 1829, adding the large importation which took place, and deducting the number manumitted, in those years, will be found not to fall short of this ; while the increase of the free black and coloured population, during the same years, making due allowance for manumissions, appears to have proceeded at the rate of at least 3 per cent.—The decrease of 31,500, mentioned above, ought to be 30,150, the increase in the Bahamas appearing not to have been deducted.—See *Anti-Slavery Reporter*, No. 26. p. 11.

whose numbers are hourly lessening, and whose lives are spent in committing crime and in receiving punishment. No, not for a day would I punish his error in judgment, by condemning him to taste the comforts which he describes, as they are enjoyed by the very luckiest of those placed under his protection. But such testimony is not peculiar to this officer. Long before his protectorate commenced, before he even came into this world of slavery and bliss, of bondage and contentment, the like opinion had been pronounced in favour of West Indian felicity.

"I hold in my hand the evidence of lord Rodney, who swore before the Privy Council that he never saw an instance of cruel treatment;—that in all the islands, 'and,' said his lordship, 'I know them all,' the negroes were better off in clothing, lodging, and food, than the poor at home, and were never in any case at all over-worked. Admiral Barington, rising in ardour of expression, as he advanced in knowledge, declares that he has often wished himself in the condition of the slaves. Neither would I take the gallant admiral at his rash word, sanctioned though it be by an oath. I would not punish his temerity so severely as to consign him to a station, compared with which he would in four and twenty hours have become reconciled to the hardest fare in the most crazy bark that ever rocked on the most perilous wave; or even to the lot which our English seamen are the least inured to—the most disastrous combat that ever lowered his flag in discomfiture and disgrace. But these officers confined not their testimony to the condition of slavery; they cast its panoply around the slave trade itself. They were just as liberal in behalf of the Guineaman, as of those whom his toils were destined to enrich. They gave just as Arcadian a picture of the slaver's deck and hold, as of the enviable fields whither she was fraught with a cargo of happy creatures, designed by their felicitous destiny to become what are called the cultivators of those romantic regions. 'The slaves on board are comfortably lodged,' says one gallant officer, 'in rooms fitted up for them.' 'They are amused with instruments of music: when tired of music, they then go to games of chance.' Let the inhabitants or the frequenters of our club houses hear this and envy—those 'famous wits' to whom St. James's purlieu are 'native or hospitable:' let them cast a longing look on the superior felicity of their sable brethren on the middle passage. They toil not, neither do they spin, yet have they found for them all earthly indulgences; food and raiment for nothing; music to charm the sense; and when, sated with such enjoyment, the mind seeks a change, games of chance are kindly provided by boon traffic, to stimulate the lazy appetite. 'The slaves,' adds the admiral, 'are indulged in all their little humours.' Whether one of these caprices might be to have themselves tied up from time to time, and lacerated with a scourge, he has omitted to mention. 'He had frequently,' he says, 'seen them, and as happy as any of the crew, it being the interest of the officers and men to make them so.' But it is admiral Evans who puts the finishing stroke to this fairy picture. 'The arrival of a Guineaman,' he says, 'is known in the West Indies by the dancing and singing of the negroes on board.' It is thus that these cargoes of merry happy creatures, torn from their families, their native fields, and their cottages, celebrate their reaching the land

of promise, and that their coming is distinguished from the dismal landing of free English seamen, out of West India traders, or other receptacles of cruelty and wretchedness!

"But if all the deductions of philosophy, and all the general indications of fact, loudly prove the unalterable wretchedness of colonial slavery, where, may it be asked, are the particular instances of its existence? Alas! there is no want of these: but I will only cull out a few, dealing purposely with the mass rather by sample than by breaking its foul bulk. I shall illustrate by a few examples the effects of slavery in communities to the exertions of which we are bid to look for the mitigation and final extinction of that horrid condition.

"A certain Reverend George Wilson Bridges was charged with an offence of the deepest dye. A slave girl had been ordered to dress a turkey for dinner, and the order having been disobeyed, he struck her a violent blow, which caused her nose and mouth to flow with blood, applying to her at the same time an oath, and a peculiarly coarse epithet, highly unbecoming in a clergyman, and indeed in any man, as it is the name most offensive to all womankind. He then commanded two men to cut bamboo rods and point them for her punishment. She was stripped of every article of dress, and flogged till the back part of her, from the shoulders to the calves of the legs, was one mass of lacerated flesh. She made her escape, and went to a magistrate. The matter was brought before what is called a council of protection, where by a majority of fourteen to four it was resolved that no further proceedings should take place. The Secretary of State for the colonies, however, thought otherwise, and in a dispatch, with no part of which have I any fault to find, directed the evidence to be laid before the attorney general. I understand that the reverend gentleman has not been put on his trial.* I hope I may have been misinformed: I shall rejoice to find it is so. I shall also be glad to find that there is no ground for the charge: although the man's servants, when examined, all admitted the severity of the flogging, and himself allowed he had seen it, though he alleged he was not near; but he could not deny he had heard the screams of the victim. This Reverend Bridges I happen to know by other works of his, by those labours of slander which have diversified the life of this minister of peace and truth. For publishing one of these, a respectable bookseller has been convicted by a jury of his country. Others have been passed over with contempt by their illustrious object—that venerable person, the great patriarch of our cause, whose days are to be numbered by acts of benevolence and of piety; whose whole life—and long may it be extended for his own glory and the good of his fellow-creatures!—has been devoted to the highest interests of religion and charity: who might have hoped to pass on his holy path undisturbed by any one calling himself a Christian pastor, even in a West Indian community. This man, however, has so far succeeded, whether by the treatment of his slaves, or the defamation of Mr. Wilberforce, in recommending himself to his fellow-citizens in Jamaica, that a great majority of the protecting council forbade his conduct being inquired into. So vain is it to expect

* Subsequent accounts state that he is to be put upon his trial.

from the owners of slaves any active execution of the laws against slavery! And will you then trust those slave owners with the making of such laws? Recollect the memorable warning of Mr. Canning, given thirty years ago, and proved true by every day's experience since. 'Have a care how you leave to the owners of slaves the task of making laws against slavery. While human nature remains the same, they never can be trusted with it.'

"It is now six years since I called the attention of Parliament to one of the most grievous outrages that ever was committed since the Charaibbean Archipelago was peopled with Negro slaves—the persecution unto death of a Christian minister, for no other offence than preaching the gospel of his Master. I was then told, that no such wrong would ever be done again. It was a single case which never could recur: at all events, the discussion in this House, and the universal reprobation called forth, even from those who had not sufficient independence to give their voices for doing justice upon the guilty, would, I was told, effectually secure the freedom of religious worship in future. I was silenced by the majority of votes, but not convinced by such reasons as these. And I now hold in my hand the proof that I was right. It is a statement promulgated by a numerous and respectable body of sincere Christians, with whom I differ both in religious and political opinions, but in whose conduct, if there be any thing which I peculiarly blame, it is their disinclination to deviate from a bad habit of passive obedience—of taking all that is done by men in authority to be right. They seem, however, now to be convinced that they have carried this habit too far, and that the time is come when they can no longer do their duty and hold their peace. The narrative which they have given, confirmed by the conduct of the Government itself, is such as would have filled me with indignation had I read it six years ago; but after the warning voice so loudly raised in the debates upon the missionary Smith's murder, I gaze upon it astonished and incredulous. The simple and affecting story is told by Mr. Orton, a blameless and pious minister of the gospel in Jamaica. He first alludes to the 'daring attack made on the mission premises at St. Ann's Bay on Christmas-day 1826' (the festival chosen by these friends of the established church for celebrating their brotherly love towards another sect). 'The attack,' says he, 'was made by a party of white persons, of the light company of militia, who were stationed at St. Ann's Bay as the Christmas guards. The plan appeared to have been premeditated, and there remains but little doubt that the design was murderous. A great number of balls were fired into the chapel and house, fourteen of which I assisted to extract from various parts of the building; and upon noticing particularly the direction, and measuring the distance from which some of the shots must have been fired, it appeared that Mr. and Mrs. Ratcliffe and their child most narrowly escaped the fatal consequences which were no doubt designed.' All attempts to bring these criminals to justice failed, it seems, for want of evidence—a somewhat extraordinary incident in a community calling itself civilized, that so many persons as must have been concerned in it should all have escaped! In the course of the next summer, Mr. Grims-

dall, another clergyman of the same persuasion, was arrested twice; the second time, for having preached at a small place called Ocho Rios, in an unlicensed house, although a licence had been applied for and refused, contrary to the judgment of the custos and another magistrate. He was flung into a noisome dungeon, 'such,' says the narrative, 'as no person in Great Britain can have any conception of. His constitution, naturally strong, could not sustain the attack—he sunk under the oppression of these persecutors, and the deleterious effects of confinement in a noxious prison; and this devoted servant of God, after a painful sickness of sixteen days, was delivered by death from the further sufferings projected by his unfeeling persecutors. He died the 15th day of December 1827.'

"Mr Whitehouse, too, was a preacher of the gospel, and consequently an object of persecution. In the summer of 1828, he was seized and carried before a magistrate, accused of having preached without a licence, that is, of having a licence in one parish and preaching in another. He besought the magistrates as a favour, to be bound in irons in the market-place, instead of being confined in the cell where his predecessor had been deprived of life. They treated his remonstrances with indifference, said they were resolved to do their duty, professed not to regard what the public might say of them, and added that 'whoever might come should be treated in the same manner.' He was accordingly flung into the dungeon where Mr. Grimsdall had perished. 'I found it,' says he, 'occupied by an insane black woman. She was removed, but the cell was exceedingly filthy, and the stench unbearable. It was now eight o'clock in the evening, and the jailor said he 'must lock up.' I desired that the cell floor might, at least, be swept, which a few friends immediately attended to. There was no bed provided for me, not even one of straw; and it was not until I had made several requests to the jailor that a few benches from the chapel were allowed to be brought in, on which to make a bed. A large quantity of vinegar, and of strong camphorated rum, was thrown upon the floor and walls for the purpose of counteracting the very disagreeable effluvia which proceeded from the filth with which the place abounded; but this produced very little effect. The sea-breeze had subsided, and the only window from which I could obtain the least air, was just above the place in which all the filth of the premises is deposited.'

"Mr. Orton received the intelligence of his persecuted brother's affliction, with a request that he would perform his pastoral duty to his congregation. He did so, and was forthwith committed to the same jail. 'Of the horrid state of the place,' he says, 'an idea can scarcely be formed from any representation which can here be made, as common decency forbids the mention of its filthy condition, and of the many unseemly practices which were constantly presented to our notice. The hospital, jail, and workhouse, are united: the two former are under one roof, occupying an area of about twenty-five feet by thirty-five. On the ground-floor were three apartments. In the condemned cell were two unfortunate creatures waiting their doom. In an adjoining cell were many negroes confined for petty offences; and in another apartment,

on the same floor, forty were crammed together, who had been taken in execution, and were waiting to be driven and sold in the market. This building, small and confined, was, especially during the night, literally stowed with persons; so that from the number of the prisoners, and the extreme filth of the negroes, it was almost unbearable.

“Let us but reflect on the sufferings of imprisonment, even in the best jail of our own temperate climate; and let us then add to those the torments of the tropical heats! Think of being inclosed with crowds beyond what the air will supply with the needful nourishment of the lungs, while a fiery sun wheels round the clear sky from morning to night, without the veil of a single cloud to throw a shade between; where all matter passes instantly from life to putrescence, and water itself, under the pestilent ray, becomes the source of every frightful malady! Add the unnatural condition of the inmates, not there for debts or for offences of their own, but seized for their owner’s default, and awaiting, not the judgment of the law, or their liberation under an insolvent act, but till the market opens, when, like brute beasts, they are to be driven and sold to the highest bidder! In such a dungeon was it that Mr. Orton and his brethren were immured; and when their strength began to sink, and it seemed plain that they must speedily follow their friend to the grave, they were taken before the Chief Justice, who instantly declared the warrant illegal, and their seventeen days’ confinement to have been without the shadow of pretence.

“Who then was in the right, six years ago, in the memorable debate upon the persecutions of the missionary Smith? You, who said enough had been done in broaching the subject, and that religion and her ministers would thenceforward be secure—or I, who warned you, that if my Resolutions were rejected, he would not, by many a one, be the last victim? I would to God that the facts did not so plainly prove me to have foretold the truth.

“I may seem to have said enough; but it is painful to me that I cannot stop here,—that I must try faintly to paint excesses unheard of in Christian times—which to match we must go back to heathen ages, to the days and to the stations wherein absolute power made men, but pagan men, prodigies of cruelty exaggerated by caprice,—that I must drag before you persons moving in the higher walks of life, and exerting proportionable influence over the society they belong to:—an English gentleman and an English gentlewoman accused, guilty, convicted of the most infernal barbarity; and an English community, so far from visiting the enormity with contempt, or indignant execration, that they make the savage perpetrators the endeared objects of esteem, respect, and affection! I read the recital from the despatch of the late Secretary for the Colonies (Mr. Huskisson), a document never to be sufficiently praised for its statesmanlike firmness, for the manly tone of feeling and of determination united which marks it throughout. ‘The slave girl,’ he says, ‘was accused of theft, but some disobedience in refusing to mend the clothes was the more immediate cause of her punishment. On the 22d of July, 1826, she was confined in the stocks, and she was not released till the 8th of August following, being a period of seventeen days. The stocks were so constructed that she could not sit up and

lie down at pleasure, and she remained in them night and day. During this period she was flogged repeatedly, one of the overseers thinks about six times, and—RED PEPPER WAS RUBBED UPON HER EYES TO PREVENT HER SLEEPING. Tasks were given her, which, in the opinion of the same overseer, she was incapable of performing; sometimes because they were beyond her powers, at other times because she could not see to do them on account of the pepper having been rubbed on her eyes: and she was flogged for failing to accomplish these tasks. A violent distemper had been prevalent on the plantation during the summer. It is in evidence, that on one of the days of her confinement she complained of fever, and that one of the floggings which she received was the day after she had made this complaint. When she was taken out of the stocks she appeared to be cramped, and was then again flogged. The very day of her release she was sent to field labour (though heretofore a house servant), and on the evening of the third day ensuing, was brought before her owners as being ill and refusing to work, and she then complained of having had fever. They were of opinion that she had none then, but gave directions to the driver, if she should be ill, to bring her to them for medicines in the morning. The driver took her to the negro-house, and again flogged her, though this time apparently without orders from her owners to do so. In the morning, at seven o'clock, she was taken to work in the field, where she died at noon.'

"Mark the refinement of their wickedness! I nowise doubt, that to screen themselves from the punishment of death due to their crimes, these wretches will now say—they did indeed say on their trial—that their hapless victim died of disease. When their own lives were in jeopardy, they found that she had caught the fever, and died by the visitation of God.—But when the question was, Shall she be flogged again? Shall she, who has for twelve days been fixed in the stocks under the fiery beams of a tropical sun,—who has been torn with the scourge from the nape of the neck to the plants of her feet,—who has had pepper rubbed in her eyes to ward off the sleep that might have stolen over her senses, and for a moment withdrawn her spirit from the fangs of her tormentors—shall SHE be subjected by those accursed fiends to the seventh scourging? Oh! then she had no sign of fever! she had caught no disease! she was all hale, and sound, and fit for the lash! At seven she was flogged—at noon she died! and those execrable and impious murderers soon found out that she had caught the malady, and perished by the 'visitation of God!' No, no! I am used to examine circumstances, to weigh evidence, and I do firmly believe that she died by the murderous hand of man! that she was killed and murdered! It was wisely said by Mr. Fox, that when some grievous crime is perpetrated in a civilized community, we are consoled by finding in all breasts a sympathy with the victim, and an approval of the punishment by which the wrong-doer expiates his offence. But in the West Indies there is no such solace to the mind—there all the feelings flow in a wrong course—perverse, preposterous, unnatural—the hatred is for the victim, the sympathy for the tormentor! I hold in my hand the proof of it in this dreadful case. The Mosses were condemned by

an iniquitous sentence ; for it was only to a small fine and five months' imprisonment. The public indignation followed the transaction ; but it was indignation against the punishment, not the crime, and against the severity, not the lenity of the infliction. The governor, a British officer—and I will name him to rescue others from the blame—General Grant—tells us in his despatch, that 'he had been applied to by the most respectable inhabitants to remit the sentence ;' that 'he loses no time in applying to Lord Bathurst to authorize the remission.' He speaks of 'the unfortunate Henry and Helen Moss ;' says, they 'are rather to be pitied for the *untoward* melancholy occurrence' (as if he were talking of some great naval victory over the Turk, instead of a savage murder,) and that 'he hastens to prevent the impression, which the mention of the case might make on his Lordship's mind.' In a second despatch, he earnestly renews the application ; describes 'the respectability of Mr. and Mrs. Moss, their general kindness to their slaves, the high estimation in which they are held by all who have partaken of their hospitality ;' tells us that 'they have always been favourably spoken of in every respect, including that of slave management ;' states his own anxiety, that 'persons of their respectability should be spared from imprisonment ;' and that at any rate 'the mulct should be relinquished, lest they should be thought cruel and oppressive beyond others, and also in order to remove in some degree the impression of their being habitually and studiously cruel ;' and he adds a fact, which speaks volumes, and may well shut all mouths that now cry aloud for leaving such things to the assemblies of the islands. 'Notwithstanding their being in gaol, they are visited by the most respectable persons in the place, and by ALL who knew them before.'

"The governor who thus thinks and thus writes, has been removed from that settlement ; but only, I say it with grief, to be made the ruler of a far more important colony. From the Bahamas he has been promoted to Trinidad—that great island which Mr. Canning described as about to be made the model by the crown, for all slave colonies. Over such a colony was he sent to preside, who, having tasted of the hospitality of the Mosses, could discern in their treatment of their slaves, nothing out of the fair, ordinary course of humane management.

"From contemplating the horrors of slavery in the West Indies, it is impossible that we can avoid the transition to that infernal traffic, alike the scourge of Africa and America, the disgrace of the old world and the curse of the new, from which so much wretchedness has flowed. It is most shocking to reflect that its ravages are still abroad desolating the earth. I do not, I believe, rate the importation into the Brazils too high, when I put it at 100,000 during the last twelve months. Now, when we recollect that the number of seventy-three capital punishments, among which are but two or three for murder, in a population of twelve millions, excites our just horror in England, what shall we say of 100,000 capital crimes committed by a handful of desperate men, every one of which involves and implies rapine, fraud, murder, torture, in frightful abundance? And yet we must stand by and see such enormities perpetrated without making any remonstrance, or even urging any representation! By the treaty with Portugal, it is true, no such

crimes can henceforth be repeated; for this year the traffic is to cease, and the mutual right of search is given to the vessels of both nations, the only possible security for the abolition being effectual.* But there is another country, nearer to us in position, and in habits of intercourse more familiar, one of far more importance for the authority of its example, in which the slave trade still flourishes in most portentous vigour, although denounced by the law and visited with infamous punishment:—the dominions of the monarch who calls himself ‘Most Christian,’ and refuses the only measure that can put such wholesale iniquity down. There it must thrive as long as groundless national jealousies prevent the right of search from being mutually conceded. Let us hope that so foul a stain on the character of so great a nation will soon be wiped away; that the people who now take the lead of all others in the march of liberty will cast far from their camp this unclean thing, by all lovers of freedom most abhorred. I have heard with amazement some thoughtless men say, that the French cannot enjoy liberty, because they are unused to it. I protest solemnly, I could point to no nation more worthy of freedom, or which knew better how to use it, how to gain it, how to defend it. I turn with a grateful heart to contemplate the glorious spectacle, now exhibited in France of patriotism, of undaunted devotion to liberty, of firm, yet temperate, resistance to arbitrary power. It is animating to every beholder; it is encouraging to all freemen in every part of the world. I earnestly hope that it may not be lost on the Bourbon monarch and his councillors; for the sake of France and of England, for the sake of peace, for the sake of the Bourbon princes themselves, I pray that they may be wise in time, and yield to the wish, the determination of their people; I pray that, bending before the coming breeze, the gathering storm may not sweep them away! But of one thing I would warn that devoted race; let them not flatter themselves that by trampling upon liberty in France, they can escape either the abhorrence of man or the divine wrath for the execrable traffic in slaves, carried on under their flag, and flourishing under their sway in Africa. I will tell their ghostly councillors in the language of a book with which they *ought* to be familiar—‘Behold, obedience is better than sacrifice, and to hearken than the fat of rams.’ To what should they lend an ear? To the commands of a God who loves mercy, and will punish injustice, and abhors blood, and will surely avenge it upon their heads; nothing the less because their patronage of slavery in distant climes is matched by their hatred of liberty at home.

“Sir, I have done. I trust that at length the time is come when parliament will no longer bear to be told that slave owners are the best lawgivers on slavery: no longer allow an appeal from the British public to such communities as those in which the Smiths and the Grimsdalls are persecuted to death for teaching the gospel to the negroes; and the Mosses holden in affectionate respect for torture and murder: no longer suffer our voice to roll across the Atlantic in empty warnings, and fruitless orders. Tell me not of rights—talk not of the property of

* From the month of March last, by the treaty with Brazil, slave-trading is made piracy, and slave-traders are punishable as pirates.

the planter in his slaves. I deny the right—I acknowledge not the property. The principles, the feelings of our common nature, rise in rebellion against it. Be the appeal made to the understanding or to the heart, the sentence is the same that rejects it. In vain you tell me of laws that sanction such a claim! There is a law above all the enactments of human codes—the same throughout the world, the same in all times—such as it was before the daring genius of Columbus pierced the night of ages, and opened to one world sources of power, wealth, and knowledge; to another, all unutterable woes;—such it is at this day: it is the law written by the finger of God on the heart of man; and by that law, eternal, unchangeable, while men despise fraud, and loathe rapine, and abhor blood, they shall reject with indignation the wild and guilty phantasy, that man can hold property in man! In vain you appeal to treaties, to covenants between nations. The covenants of the Almighty, whether the old covenant or the new, denounce such unholy pretensions. To those laws did they of old refer, who maintained the African trade. Such treaties did they cite, and not untruly; for by one shameful compact you bartered the glories of Blenheim for the traffic in blood. Yet, in despite of law and of treaty, that infernal traffic is now destroyed, and its votaries put to death like other pirates. How came this change to pass? Not assuredly by parliament leading the way; but the country at length awoke; the indignation of the people was kindled; it descended in thunder, and smote the traffic, and scattered its guilty profits to the winds. Now then let the planters beware—let their assemblies beware—let the government at home beware—let the parliament beware! The same country is once more awake,—awake to the condition of negro slavery; the same indignation kindles in the bosom of the same people; the same cloud is gathering that annihilated the slave trade: and, if it shall descend again, they, on whom its crash may fall, will not be destroyed before I have warned them: but I pray that their destruction may turn away from us the more terrible judgments of God!"

The motion of Mr. Brougham was seconded by Mr. E. PROTHEROE, who expressed his satisfaction in the opportunity of giving it his warmest support, although in so doing, he should displease many of his friends, and raise serious obstacles to his return to Parliament.

Mr. KEITH DOUGLAS entered upon a vindication of the conduct of the colonial legislatures, re-affirming many of the statements which have recently appeared in an Abstract published with the sanction of the West India committee.*

Mr. W. SMITH replied to the statements of Mr. Douglas, on the

* A full exposure of the extreme unfairness of this Abstract, indeed of its extraordinary deviations from truth, will be found in the Anti-Slavery Reporter, No. 60. Both Mr. Douglas, and afterwards Mr. Manning, endeavoured to vindicate the colonial legislatures, by gleaning from the official despatches of successive secretaries of state an occasional compliment; entirely omitting their severe animadversions on the inefficiency or injustice of the pretended colonial ameliorations. Compliments, however, do not alter the facts of the case, or give a new character to laws which are in themselves, and by the same high authority are pronounced to be, evasive, inoperative, or unjust.

subject of colonial improvement, and affirmed that the pretended compliances of the colonial assemblies with the recommendations of the Crown, were altogether evasive and ineffectual. He protested also against a system of making man the property of his fellow man, as opposed to every principle of British constitutional law, and still more as forbidden by the laws of nature and of God.

Mr. W. HORTON defended himself from the imputation of having been hostile to the anti-slavery cause, and charged the Anti-Slavery Society with inconsistency in objecting to the proprietary rights of the holders of slavers, while they contended for the adoption of the compulsory manumission clause.* His object had been to give full effect to every part of the resolutions of 1823, and no less to that part which recognised the interests of private property, than to that which pointed to the final termination of slavery; both which objects were equally contemplated by the resolutions of 1823. He further thought, that it would be most unwise in Parliament to force on the colonies laws, to frame which Parliament was very incompetent. The laws ought to be framed by the colonists abroad, and not by us at home. Nevertheless, he would strongly advise the chartered colonies to adopt into their codes the provisions of the late order in council, which he conceived, with a slight exception or two, had done all in the way of reform that was requisite. Still he thought it would be unwise to force upon the colonies an act of Parliament, though he wished them to adopt the order in council. And if they still refused to do so, we might then induce their compliance, by imposing higher duties on the produce of the refractory colonies, and lower duties on the others. He closed his speech by reading a series of resolutions in conformity with the general views he had expressed on the subject.†

Sir GEORGE MURRAY objected to the resolutions of Mr. W. Hor-

* We can see no inconsistency whatever in denying the right of one man to hold his fellow creature in bondage, and at the same time urging Government to fulfil its own pledges on the subject of manumission. If the Anti-Slavery Society cannot obtain all that they think just for the slaves, that would be a very bad reason for failing to claim on their behalf the fulfilment of every promise of relief and mitigation, which, in however slight a degree, tended to make their yoke less galling and oppressive, and their bondage less hopeless.

† We find it difficult clearly to comprehend the consistency of the reasoning here employed by Mr. Horton. He disapproves of Parliament legislating for the colonies, and says we ought to leave that work to themselves; and yet he recommends to their adoption, under pain of fiscal coercion, a slave code, not framed in the colonies, but framed in England. He deems that code to be excellent. Without stopping to dispute that point,—still that code has been framed at home, and has been forcibly imposed on six of our colonies; nor does he allege that any evil has arisen, or is likely to arise from this compulsory course. And yet he condemns it as an unwise policy to impose the same code in the same way on the other colonies. But, surely, if it is right, and has been productive of good, to legislate from home for the *Crown* colonies, it cannot be wrong and productive of evil to legislate in like manner for the *chartered* colonies. And as to his expedient for inducing these colonies to adopt this code, what is it but the use of force? We should have thought that an act of parliament, which it is admitted on all hands we have full right to pass on this subject, would be a much more simple, rational, and efficient process than that which he recommends.

ton, and to the motion of Mr. Brougham; and he strongly urged the latter not to divide the house. He expressed strongly his admiration of Mr. Brougham's speech, and declared his decided repugnance to such a condition as that of slavery, which, he thought, injurious alike to master and slave, as well as opposed to humanity and sound policy, and at variance with the principles of Christianity. He admitted fully the right of Parliament to legislate for the West Indies; and the slaves he regarded as having an equal right with every other class of the king's subjects, to the protection of the government and legislature of this country. He was averse, however, to precipitate measures. It was certainly his intention to fulfil his pledge of last year as to improving the administration of justice, and he conceived that the ends of justice would be greatly promoted by freely admitting slave evidence in all cases. He adverted to the consolidated slave law of Jamaica, which, though containing, he said, some improvements, had been disallowed on account of its inadmissible restrictions on religious toleration. Sir George concluded with assuring the House that he would continue to urge the colonies to reform their system as rapidly as it could be done, but that he felt, at the same time, the necessity of caution.*

After a few words from Mr. OTWAY CAVE, urging the early and entire abolition of slavery; and a speech from Mr. MANNING, in vindication of the colonial legislatures, and complaining of such motions as the present being brought on at the close of a Parliament, as they led to a most inconvenient catechising of candidates, an inconvenience he had painfully experienced at the last election;—Sir FRANCIS BURDETT addressed the house at some length. He supported Mr. Brougham's motion, pledging the house to an early consideration of the whole subject; and though he was inclined to believe, that they might not be able to place the matter in better hands than those of Sir G. Murray, yet it was desirable, by a resolution of that house, to quicken the sluggish movements of the colonial legislatures, to whom, however, he did not impute great blame. On the contrary, of their intentions he thought favourably, and he believed they had done much in the way of amelioration. He then suggested various expedients for improving the condition of the slaves, and gradually effecting their emancipation; but he expressed an opinion, at the same time, that the question was one of great delicacy, and requiring very

* Sir George Murray admits that the right of Parliament to legislate for the chartered colonies is as indisputable as that of the Crown to legislate for the Crown colonies. Now what is it that has justified him in imposing a slave code on the Crown colonies against their will, which would not equally justify him in proposing to impose the same code by act of Parliament on the chartered colonies? He speaks of the necessity of acting cautiously, and of avoiding precipitancy. But these considerations must have been equally valid, when he issued the Order in Council of February last, as they are now. And what makes them of more force in respect to Jamaica, Barbadoes, Antigua, &c. than they are with respect to Demerara, Trinidad, and the Mauritius? Is the reluctance of the planters to the measure greater in the former than in the latter? Or would the effects be different, or the resistance to be dreaded of a more serious and alarming character in the one case than in the other? Sir George Murray, and Sir Robert Peel (who concurred in Sir George's view of the subject), must feel that there is in fact no real distinction between the two cases.

slow and cautious advances; although he admitted, that by pursuing our inquiries with zeal and earnestness, the duration of slavery might be greatly shortened; and he held, moreover, that the emancipation of the slaves, when brought about, could not but prove, in the end, a benefit to the proprietors as well as to the slaves.*

SIR ROBERT PEEL, after highly praising the moderation and good sense which distinguished the observations of the preceding speaker, urged various objections to the expediency of giving the prospective pledge proposed by Mr. Brougham. He objected to it, among other reasons, because it pledged the House to the final abolition of slavery, whereas, he was not prepared to give any such pledge, until he saw the means of effecting it. It did so too, without adverting to compensation. He admitted he could not defend the title by which slaves were held as property, but still he thought the present holders of them had the same just claim to compensation with the holders of any other kind of property. He cautioned the House against pledging itself to any measure, leading to emancipation.—He admitted the power of Parliament to impose laws on the colonies, but he could not contemplate, without horror, an idea of going to war with them to enforce such laws.—He viewed the atrocities practised towards the slaves with deep regret, especially as he could not view them merely as if they were the acts of individuals, but as indicating that the sympathies of the colonists generally were enlisted on the side of the wrong doer and against the slave.—While he admitted, in the fullest extent, the right of Parliament to legislate for the colonies on this question, yet he should rather let the necessary measures originate in the kindly feelings of the colonists themselves, for he thought little good could be expected from reluctant legislation.†

* We were surprised by the tone of this speech. The honourable Baronet would, we think, have modified his view of this subject had he drawn his information from the only legitimate sources, particularly from the colonial statute books, the statistical and other official returns received from the colonies, and the recorded admissions of the colonists themselves; and had reasoned from them on the general principles which he would apply to every other case. If he had pursued this course, it would have been impossible that a mind like his, so sensitively alive as it has ever shown itself to the evils of oppression, could have so inadequately appreciated the evils of the very worst species of oppression which has ever darkened the history of the human race. We earnestly hope he will carefully re-examine the subject. If he does, we cannot doubt the result.

† We were still more surprised by the speech of Sir Robert Peel, than by that of the Baronet who preceded him. The concluding observation of it has already been noticed. Our chief surprise was caused by Sir Robert's reluctance to give any pledge for the final abolition of slavery. He surely must have forgotten his unqualified concurrence in those solemn resolutions of the 15th May, 1823, which deeply pledged both the Government, of which he formed a part, and the Parliament of Great Britain, to the final extinction of every trace of slavery, "at the earliest period," compatible with certain objects there specified. And if he has not forgotten this pledge, does he consider it as having been vacated by circumstances? Or is his present disclaimer to be regarded as a designed retraction of it? We hope not. And then as to the omission of which he complains, in the proposed motion, of all reference to the subject of compensation in case of abolition; in what way can the motion be viewed as shutting out that or any other part of the entire case from the consideration of Parlia-

Mr. BROUGHAM, in reply, stated that he was afraid there was but little substance in one of the objections of the right hon. Secretary to dividing the House, grounded upon the smallness of the numbers present on this occasion. He was apprehensive lest it should, by the division, be disclosed to the country how few were present on so important a question. But he did not exactly see how the circumstance could be long concealed, even if they did not divide. A secret like this, trusted to above forty individuals, like the secrets of the weaker sex, was confided to too many persons, not to reach the parties interested in the discussion, in the course of to-morrow. It was thus that the most delicate secrets always got out. A person being confided in, and afraid of not being able to keep the secret, took some one to help him, and he finding the difficulty increase, took two or three more to his assistance, and so about as many as now were present came to know it, and there was an end of the secret. In his mind, the smallness of the number who felt an interest in the settlement of the question, ought to be an additional argument with its friends for the publication of the numbers who divided upon it; because it showed that Parliament, which notwithstanding its vote of the 15th of May, 1826, had ever since done exactly and precisely nothing, continued still to evince the same slowness to redeem the pledges it had so solemnly given to the public on that former occasion. But it was said, you hurt the character of the House by dividing. He would not stop to inquire what character the House had to lose in this respect, or whether it could spare any character.—A death-bed repentance, in the case of individuals, it was said, went but a little way; perhaps, in a Parliament, it went further, especially with members' constituents on the eve of a dissolution.—But he really was amused with the ingenuous simplicity of the member for Evesham (Mr. Manning), so refreshing in an ancient senator, a West India merchant, and a Bank director—and so worthy rather of the tenderness of artless youth. He complained of the great inconvenience of being put to answer questions at his election; and said that, in 1826, a similar motion, made at the end of the last Parliament, had exposed him to be catechised, when he went to his constituents—a troublesome and even painful ceremony, he innocently said.—Would he suffer him (Mr. B.) to attend him on his death-bed—while alarmed at approaching dissolution—and minister comfort, and indeed aid to him? He could tell him how he might take the sting from dissolution, and meet his constituents without fear. Let him vote for the motion, and he would answer for their being satisfied, and re-electing him without asking any questions at all. But, again, it was objected that they should not presume to take on them the dictation of any measure to a future Parliament.—Where then was Mr. Fox's precedent, when, in 1806, he moved his resolution on the slave trade as a minister, and carried it?—What became

ment? The pledge called for by Mr. Brougham is limited to the point of an early and mature consideration of the whole subject. To such a motion, therefore, this objection is wholly inapplicable. It appears, however, that so many years have already passed fruitlessly since the pledge was first given, that even those who gave it have forgotten its import. It is surely high time, therefore, that it should be renewed.

of Mr. Canning's resolution, and the precedent he then established, relative to the pledge of concession to the Catholics, on the 22d of June, in the year 1812, when, as in the present instance, the House was on the eve of dissolution? There was also the precedent of Mr. Dundas, who was by no means an enthusiast, but remarkable as a practical man, which pointed out, as the point on which we were to keep our eye fixed, and on which we were constantly to steer—final emancipation. This plain, common sense, every day statesman, actually proposed, in 1792, a resolution which was to take effect eight years after, long before which Parliament was to be dissolved. Had that proposition been adopted, every negro born after January 1800 would have been free, and there could hardly at this day have been a slave in the Colonies.—The Honourable Baronet (Sir F. Burdett) had spoken of the evils of a *sudden* emancipation of the slave. He (Mr. B.) had reason to complain of this, (though it was the speech that had proved most gratifying to the Secretary of State of any his Hon. Friend had ever delivered,) for it misrepresented his (Mr. B.'s) views. Who talked of *sudden* emancipation? He did not say emancipate *suddenly*, but consider how you may deal with the condition of the slave, so as to set him free hereafter, which was his right and your duty. What was there alarming in giving a pledge that the subject of the mitigation and abolition of slavery should be inquired into (he pointed out no mode of inquiry) in the next Parliament?—But there was one most painful and alarming novelty in this night's debate. The minister (Sir R. Peel) had for the first time declared against emancipation—even against final emancipation: he could not go the length of committing himself to it in any shape or at any time. He differed in this, not only from himself and his colleagues in May, 1823, but from all his predecessors, even from those least friendly to the negroes—even from Mr. Dundas, and most widely from Mr. Pitt. They always avowed that ultimate emancipation was their great and common object, and that every regulation then taken must have this for its final issue. He, (Sir R. Peel,) on the contrary, took the alarm at the bare use of the word, so far were we gone back in the lapse of years, while the case had been growing daily more overpowering! Then the Hon. Bank Director (Mr. Manning) had courteously invited him (Mr. B.) and his honourable friend (Mr. W. Smith) the long tried advocate of this cause, to visit the West Indies in the ensuing vacation. One reason he had for not accepting the proffered hospitality was, that he did not perceive the proprietors of estates there to act on the same suggestion—they did not visit their plantations and their negroes—but remained here, and left the care of every thing to hired servants. Here was the root of much evil. The interest of the slave owner had not its due weight in the slaves' treatment, though always referred to in the argument; and the Colonial Assemblies were both composed and controlled differently from what they would be, were the proprietors resident on the spot. The Colonial Legislatures—made up, not of such men as the member for Dumfries, the Hon. Bank Director, Lord Seaford, or Lord Holland, men of liberal views and enlightened minds; but of the mob of low whites in those islands, and sitting among the same mob, could not, beset as they were, or carried away by their *own* preju-

dices, do what was now every hour becoming more urgently necessary.—The fact of the liberation of Moss from confinement being celebrated as a day of rejoicing, and occasioning a jubilee dinner amongst them (Moss no doubt being present, and the object of undivided solicitude and interest) showed the blackest traits of the gloomy picture of the social state of those colonies. What could be expected from them but similar conduct to that which characterised the demeanour of the same party in the West India islands, relative to the Missionary Smith, so much and so deservedly deplored? But the hour was arrived, the measure of time was completed, when neither apathy nor interest could any longer present a sufficient barrier against public opinion.—Six long years, of misery to the negroes and shame to ourselves, had rolled on since he (Mr. B.) lifted his voice, beseeching the parent state to do her duty, and warning the colonies of their coming fate. He told them that the work might still be left in their hands, but on condition that they did it. If not, England, in mercy to themselves, must stretch forth her hand and save them from the ruin into which they were rushing headlong. If, he then said, moved by no threats, scared by no auguries, deaf to all warning, they still went on, contumacious; they would ere long see that we should be trifled with no more.—Still they went on—moved by no threats, scared by no auguries, deaf to all warnings—and refusing every concession—while the indignant voice of all England echoed, in accents of impatient resentment, across the Atlantic waves. All they did was a mockery—no measure of real value was adopted. Exemption from labour on the Sabbath, to afford opportunities of religious worship, had not been given in the only way in which it could be effectual—coupled with allotting some week-day for the necessary labours of the slave in his own support. No attempt to provide the means of manumission was made. Religious liberty had been violated, by the general persecution of teachers, whose lives were blameless as their doctrines were pure. The cart-whip still rang as loud, as ceaseless as before, through all the brakes and dells of all the islands. Nothing had been done! But still the Assemblies went on, expecting that England would continue as supine as they were obstinate. They were, he trusted, greatly deceived. Even from Parliament he hoped something—but from the country he hoped all things. He knew that what the House did or left undone might be important, as it regarded its own character; and he therefore hoped it might do its duty—but if not, the affair was of moment rather to itself than to the question—for the people of England, he well knew, would do theirs.

The House then divided—

For the motion	-	-	-	-	27
Against it	-	-	-	-	56
Majority	-	-	-	-	—29

On the 16th of July some further conversation on this subject took place in the House of Commons, on the presentation of a petition from Brighton, by Mr. OTWAY CAVE, who maintained that West India proprietors possessed, and could possess no legal property in persons who were equally British subjects with themselves. Since the division of the

13th he had no longer any hopes of a change proceeding from his Majesty's Government. He trusted, therefore, that the constituency of the country would call on every candidate to pledge himself to use his best efforts to get rid of it. If this were not done, and that speedily, the negroes would be justified in the eyes of God and man in shaking off the yoke that oppressed them. Mr. TWISS and Sir GEORGE MURRAY deprecated such language, as pregnant with danger; and its use was defended by Mr. Cave.—Sir G. Murray allowed that it was indeed difficult to speak of slavery in an assembly of freemen without giving way to that warmth of expression which a contemplation of its horrors naturally excited; and he admitted it had its origin in injustice and inhumanity. But he said we could not now go back to its origin. We found such a state existing—and recognised—and what we had now to do was to ameliorate in order to get rid of it altogether; and humanity itself required we should be cautious, both in the steps we took, and the language we used.—Mr. W. SMITH took the occasion again to express his opinion that slavery had never been established by any law of this country. He thought the House was bound to interfere and put an end to the present system, for if it left the planters to their own counsels it would soon behold them plunged in irretrievable ruin. He had seen in a recent petition from certain slave-owners of Demerara the extraordinary allegation that the negroes were as much property as chairs and tables. This was a doctrine so monstrous that he never could hear it without bearing his very strongest protest against it.

Again, on the 20th July, Mr. BUXTON on presenting several petitions against slavery—among others, one from the graduates, and undergraduates of Oxford, expressed his pleasure in observing the union of the learned and unlearned in demanding the speedy abolition of slavery. He lamented that domestic circumstances had prevented his attending on Mr. Brougham's motion on the 13th. He therefore felt himself now called upon to make a few remarks on the subject. The question was now brought to this alternative. The House and the country must now take up the question—or renounce it altogether. It was utterly idle to expect any thing from the Colonial Assemblies. During seven years they had been urged to ameliorate the state of the slaves with a view to final emancipation, as held out in the resolutions of 1823; and they had done literally nothing.—In 1823, Mr. Canning had stated it as a first step to negro improvement to abolish the flogging of females. Not one Assembly had adopted the recommendation. No man, in that of Jamaica, had the courage to propose it. One man moved, indeed, that in flogging women there should be no indecent exposure of their persons, but the motion was negatived by 28 to 12.—Another of the objects of Mr. Canning was to afford the slaves facilities of religious instruction. And yet to this hour no time whatever was allotted to them in any of the colonies in lieu of Sunday, hitherto the day for raising their food and going to market. Within the last two hours he had learnt a fact, illustrative of the desire of religious improvement alleged to prevail in Jamaica. So recently as in May last, a poor negro who had been guilty of no other crime but that of attending, with his master's permission, a prayer meeting, where he joined in prayer to God, was

convicted of that heinous crime, and sentenced on account of it to be flogged with the cart-whip, and afterwards worked in chains for a fortnight.* It was plain, therefore, nothing could be done unless the

* The following is the substance of the account of this transaction which ended in the conviction and punishment of a negro named Sam Swiney, as given under the hand of the Rev. William Knibb, a Baptist Missionary, and inserted in the Jamaica Watchman of the 5th June, 1830. The transaction occurred at Savannah-la-mar, the very spot where Lieutenant Smith, whose letter has made so much noise in the world, resides.

"During my absence from Savannah-la-mar," observes Mr. Knibb, "in consequence of serious indisposition, a number of my congregation were molested by certain 'lewd fellows of the baser sort,' and which molestation has ended, according to my conception, in as manifest a perversion of justice as I have ever witnessed." "On Easter evening, part of my congregation assembled at my house, to hold a prayer meeting, which is customary in all dissenting congregations." "When they were thus engaged, much interruption was experienced from two persons of the name of Passoa and Metchener, who on the following day, after consulting the clergyman of the established church, gave information, upon which a warrant was issued for the apprehension of six free persons and six slaves." The charges on oath "the whole of which I am prepared to prove were false, and the majority of which were proved to be so on oath by three respectable gentlemen" were,

"1. That the persons were assembled for the purpose of *preaching and teaching*.

"2. That the meeting continued till between 9 and 10 at night.

"3. That such a noise was made as disturbed the whole of the neighbourhood.

"4. That a slave, John Wright, was there, who it could have been proved at that time was four miles off."

The second and third charges were disproved by the oaths of two gentlemen living opposite to Mr. Knibb's house, one of them Mr. Gibson the head constable, who testified that there was not the least noise, and that the meeting was over before eight o'clock. "Mr. Aaron Deleon, the owner of the slave Sam Swiney who suffered, informed the magistrates, being the Custos, the Hon. David Finlayson, (the speaker of the House of Assembly,) and Mr. T. W. Hardin, that he had given Sam free permission to attend the meeting: the Custos asked whether the permission was in writing, and the owner answering he was not aware it was necessary, he was told that the omission made the leave of no avail." After a long investigation, and nothing tangible appearing against the other parties, "the Custos appeared determined to find Sam Swiney, one of the slaves apprehended, guilty of something for which he might be punished: and therefore because he prayed without a book, and out of his *head*, or as one of the witnesses swore with *his lips*, he declared that praying and preaching were synonymous terms, and that he had acted illegally, and must suffer for the infraction of the law. I explained to Mr. Finlayson the nature of the meeting." "I told him that Dissenters made use of no set form of prayer, and that there was a manifest difference between preaching and praying. He replied there was not: they were the same: *praying* meant *teaching*, and *preaching* meant *teaching*, and it was nonsense to make a difference." He said, "Mr. Knibb, you have done very wrong, and if you do so again I'll take away your license."

"The result of this extraordinary proceeding was, that though the owner of the slave appeared and stated that the negro had free permission to attend the meeting: though the neighbours declared that the deposition of the informer was false, the man was without any hesitation convicted, and for simply, on his knees, offering a short prayer to God, was sentenced to receive 20 lashes, and to be worked in chains for a fortnight. Early on the following morning, I went to see the disgusting scene that was then enacted. What my feelings were I will not now express, for I beheld a fellow creature, a respectable tradesman of his class, stretched indecently on the earth, and lacerated with a cart-whip, and immediately after chained to a convict and sent to work on the road"—"to gra-

country took up the question, and unless also the electors throughout the kingdom now took it up. If the electors thought that slavery was a good thing;—that the flogging of naked women was to be borne;—that missionaries should be confined in loathsome jails for no offence but preaching the Gospel, and negroes be punished for attending, with their masters' leave, meetings for prayer:—if the electors thought all these things right and proper, then let them vote for those who support such abominations. But if not, then would they send men to this House, pledged to do their utmost, both by their voices and their votes, to put an end to so detestable a system.

Sir ALEXANDER GRANT argued that Mr. Buxton had not fairly represented the pledge of May 1823, which asserted the sacred rights of the property vested in slaves, and he referred to the resolutions of that period, as giving the planters a full title to compensation.

Mr. BUXTON replied, that he had not misrepresented the resolutions of 1823, in affirming that they looked distinctly to the final emancipation of the slaves. He did not mean to say that fair compensation should not be given by this country to the West India proprietors. Whatever claims they had on this country, which was one of the guilty parties in supporting slavery, he did not deny that they were entitled to equitable consideration; but most certainly they had no just claim, and could have none, upon the injured and oppressed slave.

In closing this brief sketch of what has recently taken place in Parliament, we turn involuntarily to the scene of bustle and conflict which its dissolution has produced. Now is the critical moment for the friends of humanity to bestir themselves on the behalf of the injured and outraged negro. We have already remarked with satisfaction the paramount importance attached to this question, by many of the electors in various parts of the kingdom. Bristol, anciently a stronghold of the African Slave Trade, and still one of the main holds of the opprobrious system of slavery which has sprung from that polluted source; Bristol has taken the lead in strenuous efforts to wipe off this foul stain, and has set an example already followed by many, and, which we trust, will be widely influential. Many of its most respectable inhabitants subscribed a public declaration, that they could "consider no man to be a fit representative of Britons" who did not regard "as sacred and inviolable articles of his political belief," that "personal freedom is the birthright of every human being; and that every person owing allegiance to the Crown of this empire is justly entitled, as the condition of such allegiance, to the full enjoyment of the civil rights and immunities of a freeborn British subject;" and they pledged their word and promise to each other and to the world, that, at the general election, they would give their respective votes "to no candidate for a seat in Parliament who would not solemnly and publicly engage to pro-

tify the prejudices of those who hold that preaching and praying are the same, and equally infractions of the law of Jamaica. Whether justice has been done in this case I leave others to determine. For my own part, I must consider that if the law sanctions such a conclusion, that law is an abomination, and a disgrace to a Christian country."

mote the practical application of those principles, whenever British Colonial Slavery should be brought under the consideration of the House of Commons."

Without any reference to this declaration, it appeared from what passed in the House of Commons on the 13th of July last, and to which we have already briefly adverted (see above, p. 333,) that Mr. Edward Protheroe, junior, having offered himself as a candidate for Bristol, with flattering prospects of success, it was no sooner known that his views were decidedly opposed to slavery, than he was threatened with the most formidable opposition from the whole West India interest; and many whose cordial support he had relied upon, turned their backs upon him, in order to seek out as a representative some decided favourer of the colonial system. They have accordingly invited Mr. James Baillie to become a candidate, and he has accepted the invitation. The battle therefore of freedom against slavery is about to be fought at Bristol. The utmost energies of the friends of slavery are now putting forth to protect their alleged inalienable right to hold their fellow men in helpless, hopeless and endless bondage; and they threaten to spare no efforts and no sacrifices which may be required to avert any infringement of that cherished privilege. We trust, however, that there will be found among a majority of the freemen of Bristol a spirit too high, and principles too pure, and a determination too firm to be moved, either by entreaty or intimidation, to bend to compromise on such a question;—too sacred a reverence for their paramount obligations as Christians, and too deep a feeling of the claims of humanity, to permit them to listen to any voice which would seduce them from the plain path of their duty. The eye of Great Britain is upon them, and whether they succeed or not in their attempt, every extremity of her wide dominion must feel the purifying and exalting influence of such an example.

But it is in the great county of York that the anti-slavery zeal seems to burn with the most intense and pervading flame. It has led to the nomination of Mr. Brougham for the representation of that county, with a demonstration of union and cordiality which seems to insure his return. And the spirit which animated a large meeting of freeholders, held at York on the 23d of July, and which issued in the nomination of that gentleman, seems but the echo of the other divisions of the county. In the East Riding the most decisive resolutions were adopted, D. Sykes, Esq., M. P., in the chair, to take advantage of this opportune period to engage on their own behalf, and to solicit others, in the name of justice, humanity, and religion, to use every lawful means of putting an end to so great an evil "as the cruel bondage in which nearly one million of our fellow-creatures are held:" and they recommend "to all who deem the buying and selling of human creatures, and holding them in slavery to be a crime," to favour those candidates only "who will engage to exert themselves in carrying into immediate effect the wisest and most practicable measures for the speedy extinction of a system by which man is made the absolute property of his fellow-man, and thereby degraded to the condition of a brute."

The cry from the West Riding is not less loud and unambiguous.

The following are the resolutions of an anti-slavery meeting held at Leeds on the 21st of July, John Clapham, Esq., in the chair.

“That it is the duty of all the Members of this Association to exert their utmost influence in the ensuing General Election, to secure the return of those Candidates alone who will give an unequivocal pledge of their determination to seek, as an object of high and primary importance, the entire extinction of Negro Slavery in the British Colonies.

“That we therefore agree and also earnestly recommend to our friends who possess the elective franchise, either for the county or for boroughs, to withhold all support from such persons as are interested in the system of Slavery, or will not assist to accomplish its extirpation.

“That the transcendent ability, and nervous and commanding eloquence with which HENRY BROUGHAM, Esq. has so often pleaded the cause of an injured race, the ardent zeal, and uniform perseverance with which he has laboured to redress their wrongs and effect their emancipation, pre-eminently entitle him to the gratitude of all true friends of civil and religious liberty, and signally mark him out as the fittest representative of the opinions and wishes of the Freeholders of this great County, who demand the Abolition of Slavery as an evil of fearful magnitude, directly opposed to the well-being and happiness of man, the Law of God, and the Religion of Christ.

“That should Mr. Brougham permit himself to be proposed as a Candidate for the Representation of Yorkshire,—we do, in accordance with our avowed principles, and on the ground of his past exertions in this righteous cause, and his pledge of future and more entire self-devotement to it, faithfully bind ourselves to give him our most strenuous support, and to forward his election by every constitutional means.”

An address accompanied the resolutions, from which we extract a few sentences.

“Beneath the sceptre of your King, whose brightest glory it is that He is called to reign over freemen; and under the Law of your country, whose proudest boast is the equal security and well-being of all;—nearly a million of the human family—our fellow-creatures in kind, reason, moral capability, and immortal destiny,—are held as captives, rated as chattels, yoked as beasts, and branded as criminals, without the pretext or allegation of any offence.”

“It is for you to say, and for your loud voice to determine, whether this monstrous evil shall be any longer endured.

“Firmly reject, peremptorily discountenance, any candidate who will not explicitly and decidedly pledge himself to measures which shall exterminate this horrible enormity.

“An opportunity, the most providential, now occurs of proclaiming your sentiments against this unequalled wrong on our Common Nature, and this foul scandal on the Christian name.

“You poured forth your thousands to support Wilberforce when he stood the champion of Africa against the traffic in her children: prove that you have not degenerated from the lofty standard of your own example.

“A patriot the most unshrinking, a philanthropist the most indefatigable, a statesman the most acute and eloquent, will stand forward on

your County hustings, to receive your command that Slavery shall cease to the ends of the earth."

"Never was there a more urgent occasion for your strenuous and united exertions,—never a more noble and disinterested cause to engage them.

"Your character as Christians is in the balance !

"How can you answer it to Him who heareth the groaning of the prisoner—how can you answer it to the brother for whom Christ died---how can you answer it to yourselves,---if you forego the opportunity of exercising your franchise or influence on behalf of this deeply injured race ?

"With you it rests, under God, whether the bondman shall go free,---whether your fellow-man shall be reinstated in the rights of manhood,---whether tens of thousands of your fellow-Christians, 'born again' to the Saviour in their cruel exile or servitude, shall be welcomed to the Christian charter,---the privileges of which their injuries have only endeared ;---from which privileges no circumstance, no law, any more than the accidents of birth and complexion, can justly exclude them !

"Brother Christians!---Allow no discouragements, fear no difficulties ; fortify yourselves with your cause ; rejoice in the testimony of your conscience ; carry out your principles ; be true to yourselves ; and soon the last rivet of slavery shall be broken, and even its last scar be effaced."

II.—ILLUSTRATION OF JAMAICA SOCIETY AND MANNERS.

Want of room alone prevents our conveying to our readers much interesting intelligence recently received from the West Indies, exhibiting in lively colours the disgusting effects of the miserable system, which converts that smiling region of the earth into a loathsome Lazar-or rather Charnel-house. We have scarcely room left for a brief abstract of a single case. It is that of a mulatto female slave, named ELEANOR MEAD, belonging to Colchis estate, in the parish of Trelawney. Her mistress, Mrs. Earnshaw, who is described by some as a lady of humanity and delicacy, having taken offence at something which this slave had said or done, in the course of a quarrel with another slave, ordered her to be stripped naked, prostrated on the ground, and in her own presence caused the male driver to inflict upon her bared body fifty-eight lashes of the cart whip. This happened about the 1st of April last.—Eleanor Mead was the mother of nine children. One of the persons ordered to hold her prostrate during the punishment, was her own daughter Catherine. When one hip had been sufficiently lacerated in the opinion of Mrs. Earnshaw, she told the driver to go round and flog the other side. On rising up after the infliction, the woman proceeded to pull down her clothes which had been raised up towards her shoulders. Mrs. Earnshaw would not permit her to do so, but ordered her to be conveyed, in her naked and exposed state, by two men, to the bilboes, she herself walking behind till she reached the bilboes, and had her feet fastened in them.—On the character given to Mrs. Earnshaw for humanity and delicacy, the Editor of the *Watchman* inquires what opinion could be formed of her delicacy, "when she could order the clothes of a woman

to be taken up in her presence and in the presence of negro men; or of her humanity, when she could calmly stand by and suffer fifty-eight lashes to be inflicted on an unfortunate wretch who had been the mother of nine children, one of whom she compelled to assist in the punishment of her own parent, by holding her down while she was writhing under the lash? Where was her humanity when after ~~one~~ side was flogged she told the driver to turn round and flog the other? And where was her modesty when she refused her slave to pull down her clothes, and when she walked behind her in a state of nudity with a bleeding body from the house to the bilboes?"

In the course of the same evening, Eleanor Mead escaped from the bilboes, and reached Falmouth along with her daughter Catharine, and there made her complaint to the Custos, Mr. Miller. Mr. Miller and his brother magistrate, though they saw that a severe punishment had been inflicted, yet having no evidence but that of slaves to prove that the punishment had exceeded thirty-nine lashes, sent the complainant and her daughter back to Colchis, with a letter stating, that as she had not been *proved* to have received a punishment contrary to law, she had been ordered home, and they requested she might be allowed to resume her *usual employment*, which was that of a house servant. On returning to the estate however, neither she nor her daughter were restored to their usual employment, but were ordered into the field with a hoe and bill. On refusing to go, they were placed in the stocks, and on the following day, the 8th of April, 1830, Eleanor Mead was sent by the attorney of the estate, Mr. Frater, to the workhouse, with an order to the superintendent, authorizing him to receive her, and there safely keep her for one month, giving her thirty-nine lashes on going in. In her way thither, she contrived to present herself to the view of a magistrate, Mr. Ogilvy, who, on hearing her statement and reading Mr. Frater's order, interposed to prevent this second punishment from being carried into effect, "the consequences of which" he thought, "might have been of a serious nature, as she had not recovered from the effects of the first." This interference on the part of the magistrate, excited loud complaints on the part of Mr. Frater, who vehemently accused him of illegal and improper interference with the power of the master.*

* On the 7th April, 1830, Mr Frater informed the Custos by letter, that he had not only sent the mother, Eleanor Mead, to the workhouse, to be punished with thirty-nine lashes more, but that he had ordered the overseer of Colchis to inflict also on the daughter Catharine, thirty-nine lashes, and "to keep her confined till she behaves herself." The Custos replied on the 8th April, by recommending more lenient measures to Mr. Frater than he had stated it to be his intention to pursue. On the 12th, Mr. Frater repels, with indignation, the caution of the Custos, and says "I will defy the world to accuse me of any improper or cruel act towards a slave during my residence in this country, of upwards of thirty years." The slave law, he adds, "requires that the complaint of the slave being proved frivolous, the magistrates should give redress to the master by punishing the slave—and not," as had been done in this instance, "to adopt a mistaken philanthropy by turning the slave back on the owner, with directions that no further notice is to be taken of their misconduct." "Such a decision" he adds, "never could have been contemplated by the legislature in enacting this law, for it is striking at the very root of our constitutional rights that we are so strenuously defending."

On the 3d of May, the case was submitted to a board of twenty-three magistrates, when it was resolved by a majority of nineteen to four, to forward the whole of the evidence to the Attorney-General for his opinion. Among the witnesses examined were two surgeons.—Dr. Neilson the surgeon of the workhouse, saw Eleanor Mead, first, on the 2nd of April,—“she had many marks of punishment on her posteriors and thighs in about ten or a dozen places; the lashes had penetrated the skin and lacerated the parts.—Saw her again on the 9th, when the sores had been scabbed over, but none of them were well. Witness considered the punishment severe for a woman of her age and colour, although he could not say that the law had been exceeded. Never saw such a punishment inflicted on a person of her description. She was not in a fit state to receive a second punishment, the parts being still lacerated.”—Dr. Perkins, the surgeon of the plantation Colchis, was sent by Mr. Frater on the 17th of April to examine her. He testified that “he found the skin completely healed and she was perfectly well, but had the appearance of recent punishment. He cannot say how many lashes were inflicted, being so blended with old marks of punishments. Cannot say if she had received fifty lashes. Had not the appearance of so many. Should not think her capable of doing heavy or gang work or cutting canes.”

The Attorney-General's opinion, dated the 15th May, 1830, is, that as he cannot receive the evidence of slaves as proving excess of punishment, (that is to say, above thirty-nine lashes) and there being no other direct proof to that point, he thinks no case is substantiated against Mrs. Earnshaw. And as to the charge of a second punishment being ordered when the slave had not recovered from the former one, the magistrates, he conceived, had acted properly in suspending it, but the offence was not complete so as to form a ground of prosecution, unless such second punishment had actually been inflicted.

Two days after, on the 17th of May, Eleanor Mead was sent back to Colchis, and placed under the uncontrolled power of Mrs. Earnshaw and Mr. Frater !

We have been obliged to abridge much of this case, and to omit many observations suggested by it, but we may again recur to it. The particulars are fully detailed in the Jamaica Watchman of May 29 and June 2 and 5, 1830.

The argument on which Mr. Frater chiefly insisted as justifying himself and Mrs. Earnshaw, and condemning the magistrates, was that “*the law gave him power to punish his slave, provided he did not exceed the law; and to put him to any work he chose.*” The observations of Mr. Barrett, one of the magistrates, on this plea was—“Look at the complainant, a poor weakly woman ! Can it be for a moment contended, that the law gives the master power to inflict the same punishment on a weakly woman as on an able bodied negro man, or to put her to work which she cannot physically perform ? No ! the law curtails the power of the owner.” Mr. Frater however was right, and Mr. Barrett wrong in his interpretation of the law according to the Attorney-General.—Such are the laws of Jamaica !

*Donations and Remittances in Aid of the Funds of the Anti-Slavery Society, from the General Meeting, May 15, to July 24, 1830.**

	£.	s.	d.
Collection at General Meeting	64	1	9
His Royal Highness the Duke of Gloucester (annual donation)	10	10	0
Pontefract Association (donation)	10	0	0
Southampton Ladies' Association (donation)	10	0	0
Ditto ditto (payment for Reporters)	2	6	0
Beverley Ladies ditto (£5. donation £3. payment)	8	0	0
Tewksbury Association (payment)	6	19	1
Lewes ditto ditto	3	17	1
Doncaster ditto ditto	11	5	0
Mrs. Drew, Roehampton (donation)	1	0	0
J. J. Briscoe, Esq. ditto	1	1	0
J. T. Price, Esq. ditto	1	0	0
B. J. Wood, Esq. (annual subscription)	1	1	0
Rev. Charles Stuart (donation)	1	0	0
Captain Hawkins (annual subscription)	1	0	0
Ditto (payment)	4	0	0
G. T. Clark, Esq. (annual subscription)	1	1	0
W. Albright, Esq. Charlbury (donation)	1	0	0
Rochester Ladies' Association ditto	10	0	0
Ditto ditto (payment)	2	15	6
Horsham Association (payment)	4	19	6
Chelmsford Ladies' Association (donation)	10	0	0
Coalbrookdale Association (donation)	11	13	10
Ditto (payment)	5	0	6
Leominster Association ditto	1	14	6
Berkhamstead, Tring, &c. ditto (donation)	5	0	0
West Bromwich, Birmingham, &c. (payment)	5	5	9
Joseph Sturge, Esq. Birmingham (donation)	10	10	0
Charles Sturge, Esq.	5	0	0
Charles Elliot, Esq. (annual subscriber)	2	2	0
Joseph Dimsdale, Esq. ditto	1	1	0
Halifax Association, (payment)	5	19	8
Gainsborough, ditto, per Maw Bowen, Esq. (donation)	26	9	0
Ditto ditto ditto (payment)	13	11	0
Bristol, ditto (donation)	25	0	0
Ditto ditto (payment)	13	16	0
W. Johnson, Esq. Cork (donation)	2	2	0
Rev. T. Weaver ditto	1	0	0
Thomas Wilson, Esq. ditto	10	10	0
Clapham Ladies' Association, ditto	20	0	0
Stoke Newington, ditto, ditto (payment)	1	4	6
Margate Association ditto	2	10	0
Ditto ditto (donation)	1	5	1
Keyhaven Association ditto	3	4	10
Rev. J. H. Malpas ditto	1	1	0
Plymouth Association ditto	5	0	0
Miss S. Wedgwood, Camphill ditto	40	0	0
Geo. Long, Esq. ditto	1	1	0
F. W. Austin, Esq. ditto	1	0	0

* It is intended to publish a list of contributions to the funds of the Society, in this manner, from time to time, exclusive of the Annual Account of Receipts and Disbursements, made up at the close of each year. The Accounts and Lists of Subscribers for 1829, and 1830, will be printed in January 1831.

